# EXHIBIT 13

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
90/007,542	05/13/2005	6331415	22338-10230	7585
47554	7590 02/10/2009		EXAM	INER
	USTIN LLP PATENT DOCKETING			
1501 K STR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHING	TON, DC 20005			
1			DATE MAILED: 02/10/2009	9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box1450
Alexandría, VA 22313-1450

#### DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

LISA V. MUELLER WOOD PHILLIPS KATZ CLARK & MORTIMER 3800 WEST MADISON STREET, SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661 MAILED FEB 1 1 2009

CENTRAL REEXAMINATION UNIT

## **EXPARTE REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM**

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. 90/007,542. £ 90/007859

PATENT NO. 6331415.

ART UNIT 3991.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

PTOL-465 (Rev.07-04)

Case 2:08-cv-03573-MRP -JEM Docum	<u>ent 250-13 Filed 07/</u>	12/10 Page 4 of 6 Page ID	
	<b>ஒற்றூரும்</b> .	Patent Under Reexamination	
Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary	90/007,859 & 90/007542	6331415	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Padmashri Ponnaluri	3991	
All participants (USPTO personnel, patent owner, patent of	owner's representative):		
(1) Padmashri Ponnaluri, Deborar Jones	(3) <u>Jeffrey Kushan</u>		
(2) Evelyn Huang, Brenda Brumback	(4) Wendy Lee		
Date of Interview: 10 February 2009			
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal (copy given to: 1)☐ patent owne	faxed 10 patent owner's r	epresentative)	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.	·	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Any other agreement(s) are set forth below under "Description of the general nature of what was agreed to"			
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-33</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>prior art of record</u> .			
Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>			
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims patentable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims patentable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)			
A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 2281). IF A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION HAS ALREADY BEEN FILED, THEN PATENT OWNER IS GIVEN <b>ONE MONTH</b> FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO PROVIDE THE MANDATORY STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (37 CFR 1.560(b)). THE REQUIREMENT FOR PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT CAN NOT BE WAIVED. <b>EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).</b>			
		·	
		·	
		po 2/10/09	
	/		
cc: Requester (if third party requester)			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-474 (Rev. 04-01)

Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary

Paper No. 20090210

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-474)

and light chain are produced as separate molecules in said host cell."

Reexam Control No. 90/007,859

Continuation of Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the term "immunoglobulin molecule" in claims 1 and 33.

Based on the prosecution history, declarations presented in the present case, and Interference record of the present Cabilly Patent, the "immunoglobulin molecule" is considered to be a immunologically functional immunoglobulin molecule.

Regarding Claim 21, discussed the possibility of amending the claim to include in step d), "so that said immunoglobulin heavy

## Case 2:08-cv-03573-MRP -JEM Document 250-13 Filed 07/12/10 Page 6 of 6 Page ID #:5265

INFORMATION	Docket No.	22338-10230, -10231	Control No:	90/ 007,542 90/ 007,859
DISCLOSURE	Inventor(s):	Cabilly, US 6,331,415	Examiner:	P. Ponnaluri
STATEMENT	Filed:	13 May 2005 ('542) 23 December 2005 ('859)	Art Unit:	3991

## **OTHER DOCUMENTS**

INITIAL	INDEX	CITATION
	M1	Huber R. <i>Klin. Wochenschr.</i> 58: 1217-31, 1980. Spatial structure of immunoglobulin molecules.
	M2	Putnam F.W. <i>Science</i> 163: 633-43, 1969. Immunoglobulin structure: variability and homology.

EXAMINER	DATE
	CONSIDERED
l	

Initial if a citation is considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP § 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include a copy of this form with the next communication to applicant.

Form PTO-1449 (modified) SHEET 1 OF 1